

REMARKS

Minor corrections have been made to the specification. Claims 1 and 5-6 have been cancelled. Claims 2-4 and 7 have been amended. Claims 8-11 have been added. Claims 2-4 and 7-11 remain pending. Reconsideration and reexamination of the application, as amended, are requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Barton. Barton discloses the use of a male tube member to be interference fitted into a female joint element to provide a sealed joint without the need for soldering, braising, or welding. Barton does not disclose a pipe member formed by a process wherein a multiple pipe structure of a metal pipe of a larger diameter engaging the outside of the metal pipe of a smaller diameter is integrally expanded so as to expand the diameter of the multiple pipe structure. The pipe member formed by this process thus has a multiple pipe structure which has been integrally expanded. Such structure is not disclosed by Barton. Claim 8 which replaces claim 1 is therefore not anticipated by Barton. Likewise, claims 2-4 which depend from claim 8 are also patentable. Claim 9 is a new method claim similar to the process claimed in the product by process of claim 8. Claim 9 is also patentable.

Claim 10 replaces claim 6. Claim 10 is a product by process claim wherein first and second clamping dies hold at least portions of first and second metal pipes such that the diameter of the second portion of the second metal pipe is changed when the first and second axes of the first and second clamping dies are aligned and advanced toward one another so that the first and second metal pipes are fitted together. Barton does not disclose a pipe member as claimed in claim 10 wherein the diameter of the second portion of the second metal pipe is changed as the first and second metal pipes are fitted together. Consequently, Barton does not anticipate claim 10 and claim 7 which depends from it. Likewise, claim 11 claims a method similar to the process claimed in the product by process claimed in claim 10 and is also patentable.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-3 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ward. Ward likewise joins pipe ends by interference fitting. As discussed above, Ward does not disclose a pipe member wherein a multiple pipe structure exists due to expanding integrally a metal pipe of a larger diameter which engages the outside of a metal pipe of a small diameter

such that the diameter of the metal pipe structure is expanded. Thus, Ward does not anticipate the metal pipe structure and consequently the pipe member of claim 8. Also, Ward does not anticipate claims 2-4 which depend from claim 8. Likewise, Ward does not disclose the pipe member of claim 10 wherein the diameter of the second portion of the second metal pipe is changed due to advancing the first and second pipes which are in first and second dies toward one another so that the first and second pipes are fitted together in this way. Claim 7 depends from claim 10 and is also not anticipated by Ward. Likewise, claim 11 is not anticipated since it claims a similar process as the process claimed in the product by process of claim 10.

The Examiner rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious on consideration of Ward or Barton in view of Lago. Claim 4 depends from claim 8 and should be patentable. Applicant does not acquiesce in the rejection of claim 4, but at this time believes that independent argument is not needed.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and reexamination are requested. Allowance of claims 2-4 and 7-11 at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.  
P.O. Box 2903  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903  
(612) 332-5300

Date:

Jan. 21, 2003

Curtis B. Hamre  
Curtis B. Hamre  
Reg. No. 29,165  
CBH:PSTdb

10/079,611

**VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE****In the Specification**

The paragraph beginning on page 2, line 11 has been replaced with the following rewritten paragraph:

In the pipe member of an integral type shown in Fig. [9]11, the material, outer diameter and thickness are determined according to a section where strength and rigidity are most required. Accordingly, there is overspecification for such a section where strength and rigidity are not required, resulting in overweight. The manufacture of the pipe member of the split type shown in Fig. 12 is highly costly because of the joint.

**In the Claims**

Claims 1, 5 and 6 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 2-4 and 7 have been amended to read as follows:

2. (Once Amended) The pipe member according to claim [1]8, wherein an end of the multiple-pipe structure section is provided with a tapered section of which the amount of diameter expansion gradually increases.

3. (Once Amended) The pipe member according to claim [1]8, wherein one metal pipe forming the multiple pipes is of a different material than the other metal pipes.

4. (Once Amended) The pipe member according to claim [1]8, wherein one metal pipe forming the multiple pipes is made of aluminum and the other metal pipes are made of steels.

7. (Once Amended) The pipe member according to claim [6]10, wherein the diameter of the multiple-pipe structure section is expanded

Claims 8-11 are new.